UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/687,991	10/13/2000	Jai Rawat	OBON0003	1050

22862 7590 01/27/2006

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER	
SALAD, ABDULLAHI ELMI	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2157	

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/687,991	RAWAT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Salad E. Abdullahi	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 June 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5,8-10,13-16,19-22,24-26 and 28-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3, 5, 8-10, 13-16, 19-22, 24-26 and 28-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response

1. The response filed on 6/1/2005 has been received and made of record.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 13-16, 19-22, 24-26 and 28-30 have been fully considered but are not persuasive for the following reasons.

Applicant alleges the references fail to teach "form filling program instructions residing on said first computer server for creating a filled form by filling In said blank form using a fuzzy fill procedure" and form submitting program instructions residing on said first computer sewer. Using a result of said form filling program instructions, for automatically submitting said filled form to a second computer server".

Examiner respectfully disagrees because it seems the applicant is arguing the references individually. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Furthermore, Gupta discloses a system for automating data transactions among computer servers, where one computer server receives a form and fills with user information and transmits to another computer server (see figs. 3a, 4a, 4b and col. 10, lines 13-65). Gupta does not show using fuzzy logic, nonetheless the principles of fuzzy logic or artificial intelligence to complete forms is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to Gupta system as evidenced by Hitt. Hitt discloses an automated document identification and retrieval system for filling an empty form for

information extracted from database using fuzzy fill procedure (fuzzy logic or artificial intelligence) (see col. 4, lines 51-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the fuzzy fill procedure (fuzzy logic procedure) as taught by Hitt into system such that fuzzy logic is used to automatically fill forms to eliminate the necessity of manual entry of data.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 13-16, 19-22, 24-26 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta U.S. Patent No. 5,963,949 [hereinafter Gupta] in view of Hitt U.S. Patent No. 6,249,779[hereinafter Hitt]

As per claims 1, Gupta discloses a system for automating data transactions between computers servers, comprising:

a first computer server (see fig. 1c, 140) maintaining a database having stored data recorded therein, said stored data comprising general user information (users meta data) relating plurality of servers and specific user information (180) associated with a user and maintained at each server of said plurality of servers(see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11 28);

program code (applet) residing on said first computer server for creating extracted data by selectively extracting said stored data responsive to a request (see col. 8, lines 15 54); and

additional program code residing on said first computer server for obtaining a blank form, and for parsing said blank form to identify which of said extracted data should be used to fill in at least a part of said blank form (see col. 8, lines 15-54);

form filing program residing on the on the first server for creating a filled form in said blank form using an automated fill procedure (see col. 1, lines 17-39).

submitting the automatically filled to a second server (sending the filled to a selective proxy) (see col. 8, lines 55-67)

Gupta is silent regarding: using fuzzy fill procedure.

Nonetheless, the principles of fuzzy logic or artificial intelligence to complete forms is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to Gupta system as evidenced by Hitt. Hitt discloses an automated document identification and retrieval system for filling an empty form for information extracted from database using fuzzy fill

procedure (fuzzy logic or artificial intelligence) (see col. 4, lines 51-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the fuzzy fill procedure (fuzzy logic procedure) as taught by Hitt into system such that fuzzy logic is used to automatically fill forms to eliminate the necessity of manual entry of data.

In considering claim 2, Gupta discloses a system, wherein said extracted data includes data for all fields in said blank form (col. 8, lines 15-54).

In considering claim 3, Gupta discloses a system, wherein said blank form is obtained from a second computer server (form originating server) (see fig. 1c and col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 14).

In considering claim 5, Gupta discloses a system, wherein said blank form is a login form (col. 3, lines 44-55).

In considering claim 8, Gupta discloses a system, further comprising:
an additional database maintained at said first computer server (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28);
additional database having stored form data recorded therein (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28);

stored form data relating to forms required by at least one other computer server (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28).

In considering claim 9, Gupta discloses comparing data fields in said blank form with said stored form data recorded in said additional database (col. 8, lines 15-54).

In considering claim 10, Gupta discloses a system wherein said stored form data includes parsed form data from said at least one other computer server (col. 8, lines 15-54).

As per claim 13, Gupta discloses a method for automating data transactions between computers servers, comprising:
a first computer server (see fig. 1c, 140) maintaining a database having stored data recorded therein, said stored data comprising general user information (users meta data) relating plurality of servers and specific user information (180) associated with a user and maintained at each server of said plurality of servers((see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28);
program code (applet) residing on said first computer server for creating extracted data by selectively extracting said stored data responsive to a request (see col. 8, lines 15 54); and
additional program code residing on said first computer server for obtaining a blank form, and for parsing said blank form to identify which of said extracted data should be

used to fill in at least a part of said blank form (see col. 8, lines 15-54);

form filing program residing on the on the first server for creating a filled form in said blank form using an automated fill procedure (see col. 1, lines 17-39).

submitting the automatically filled to a second server (sending the filled to a selective proxy) (see col. 8, lines 55-67)

Gupta is silent regarding: using fuzzy fill procedure.

Nonetheless, the principles of fuzzy logic or artificial intelligence to complete forms is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to Gupta system as evidenced by Hitt. Hitt discloses an automated document identification and retrieval system for filling an empty form for information extracted from database using fuzzy fill procedure (fuzzy logic or artificial intelligence) (see col. 4, lines 51-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the fuzzy fill procedure (fuzzy logic procedure) as taught by Hitt into system such that fuzzy logic is used to automatically fill forms to eliminate the necessity of manual entry of data.

In considering claim 15, Gupta discloses a system, wherein said blank form is obtained from a second computer server (form originating server) see fig. 1c and col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 14).

In considering claim 16, Gupta discloses a system, wherein said blank form is a login form (col. 3, lines 44-55).

In considering claim 19, Gupta discloses a system, further comprising:

an additional database maintained at said first computer server (see col. 1, lines 18-59 and col. 3, lines 20-65);

additional database having stored form data recorded therein (see col. 1, lines 18-59 and col. 3, lines 20-65);

stored form data relating to forms required by at least one other computer server (see col. 1, lines 18-59 and col. 3, lines 20-65).

In considering claim 20, comparing data fields in said blank form with said stored form data recorded in said additional database (see col. 3, lines 20-64).

In considering claim 21, Gupta discloses a system wherein said stored form data includes parsed form data from said at least one other computer server (see col. 1, lines 18-59).

In considering claim 22, Hitt discloses a system further comprising: as result of parsing filling in said blank form using fuzzy fill procedure (see col. 4, lines 51-36).

As per claim 24, Gupta discloses a system for automating data transactions between computers servers, comprising:

a first computer server (see fig. 1c, 140) maintaining a database having stored data recorded therein, said stored data comprising general user information (users meta data) relating plurality of servers and specific user information (180) associated with a user

and maintained at each server of said plurality of servers((see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28);

program code (applet) residing on said first computer server for creating extracted data by selectively extracting said stored data responsive to a request (see col. 8, lines15-54); and

additional program code residing on said first computer server for obtaining a blank form, and for parsing said blank form to identify which of said extracted data should be used to fill in at least a part of said blank form (see col. 8, lines 15-54);

form filing program residing on the on the first server for creating a filled form in said blank form using an automated fill procedure (see col. 1, lines 17-39).

submitting the automatically filled to a second server (sending the filled to a selective proxy) (see col. 8, lines 55-67)

Gupta is silent regarding: using fuzzy fill procedure.

Nonetheless, the principles of fuzzy logic or artificial intelligence to complete forms is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to Gupta system as evidenced by Hitt. Hitt discloses an automated document identification and retrieval system for filling an empty form for information extracted from database using fuzzy fill procedure (fuzzy logic or artificial intelligence) (see col. 4, lines 51-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the fuzzy fill procedure (fuzzy logic procedure) as taught by Hitt into system such that fuzzy logic is used to automatically fill forms to eliminate the necessity of manual entry of data.

In considering claim 25, Gupta discloses a system, wherein said extracted data includes data for all fields in said blank form (col. 1, lines 18-59).

In considering claim 26, Gupta discloses a system, wherein said blank form is obtained from a second computer server (form originating server) (see fig. 2, element 14).

In considering claims 28 Gupta discloses a system, further comprising:
an additional database maintained at said first computer server (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28);
additional database having stored form data recorded therein (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28);
stored form data relating to forms required by at least one other computer server (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28).

In considering claim 29, comparing data fields in said blank form with said stored form data recorded in said additional database (see col. 3, lines 20-64).

In considering claim 30, Gupta discloses a system, further comprising:
an additional database maintained at said first computer server (see col. 1, lines 18-59 and col. 3, lines 20-65);

additional database having stored form data recorded therein (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28);

stored form data relating to forms required by at least one other computer server (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28).

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

CONCLUSION

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Salad E Abdullahi whose telephone number is 571-272-4009. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00. If attempts to reach the

examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300.**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

Abdullahi Salad
1/21/2005